

United States District Court  
Northern District Of Georgia  
Atlanta Division

Coreco Jaqan Pearson, )  
et al., )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

Brian Kemp, et al., )

Defendant. )

Civil Action  
File No. 1:20-CV-4809-TCB

Atlanta, Georgia  
Sunday November 29, 2020  
7:45 p.m.

Transcript of Motions Hearing  
Before The Honorable Timothy C. Batten, Sr.  
United States District Judge

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

Sidney Powell  
L. Lin Wood, Jr.  
Howard Kleinhendler  
Harry MacDougald  
Christine Dial Buckler  
Attorneys at Law

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

Russell David Willard  
Charlene Swartz McGowan  
Attorneys at Law

Lori Burgess, Official Court Reporter  
(404) 215-1528

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript  
produced by CAT.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 THE COURT: Hi. I'm Judge Batten.

2 THE CLERK: I think we have everybody here. Harry  
3 MacDougald.

4 MR. MACDOUGALD: I want to announce that my  
5 associate Christine Buckler is in the office with me but off  
6 camera.

7 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. MacDougald.

8 THE CLERK: Howard Kleinhendler.

9 THE COURT: Howard. Who are you with?

10 MR. KLEINHENDLER: I am with the Plaintiffs.

11 THE COURT: Keep going.

12 THE CLERK: Sidney Powell.

13 THE COURT: I don't see Ms. Powell.

14 MS. POWELL: I am also here with Lin Wood for the  
15 Plaintiffs.

16 THE COURT: I don't see either of y'all.

17 THE CLERK: If you will turn on your video, please,  
18 Ms. Powell.

19 MS. POWELL: I am not sure it is working properly,  
20 but I have given it my best shot.

21 THE COURT: Who else do we have on the call besides  
22 Ms. Powell and Mr. Wood?

23 THE CLERK: Charlene McGowan.

24 THE COURT: Is she on the video?

25 THE CLERK: Everyone's video is on except Ms. Powell

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 and Rus Willard.

2 THE COURT: I can't see everybody. I suppose that  
3 is okay as long as I can hear everybody. So I think we are  
4 ready to proceed. Are the Plaintiffs ready to proceed and are  
5 the Defendants ready to proceed? One at a time. Plaintiffs?

6 MS. POWELL: Yes.

7 THE COURT: And the Defendants?

8 MR. WILLARD: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: You know, I am not really sure exactly  
10 what it is the Plaintiffs are trying to obtain in the case  
11 right now regarding these machines. There has been a mention  
12 of wiping of a machine at the World Congress Center, and also  
13 been a discussion about reference to the fact that Union  
14 County is going to wipe their machines. You know, I  
15 understand that these county officials are obligated by state  
16 law to preserve the data from the election on November 3.  
17 What is it exactly that the Plaintiffs want me to order the  
18 Secretary of State and/or the other Defendants to do? I am  
19 not -- excuse me, I am sorry -- I am not talking about  
20 ultimately under the complaint that has been filed, I am  
21 talking about this emergency temporary relief right now. I  
22 know you want me to throw out the election results and et  
23 cetera, but I just mean on the short-term basis, what is it  
24 exactly that the Plaintiffs would like? Ms. Powell?

25 MS. POWELL: Right now what you ordered in your

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 first order of the day would be perfect. We need access to  
2 the machines as soon as possible so we can do mirror images of  
3 the data that is on there and the operations that are on  
4 there, because it's well-established throughout Dominion  
5 software systems and anybody who knows anything about them  
6 that they can be easily altered. And we understand, from what  
7 is going on at the Center today, that process has already  
8 begun. Apparently from 11:00 to 1:30 they began substituting  
9 software in the machines that was completely unnecessary to  
10 count the ballots.

11 THE COURT: Let me stop you right there and ask  
12 Mr. Willard, first of all, I understand the State's  
13 argument that -- the Defendants' argument that the Plaintiffs  
14 lack standing. I also understand that they cite *Jacobson* for  
15 the proposition that they aren't the right people to be sued  
16 to provide this relief and that instead it should have been  
17 the county elections officers. I understand all of that. But  
18 I am wondering, and I am just trying to get factual  
19 information here, what is it about access to the voting  
20 machines that the Defendants have a problem with? Why can't  
21 the Plaintiffs' experts go ahead and do a forensic  
22 examination? Are they going to damage anything or in any  
23 other way interfere with the performance of the government  
24 officials' duties?

25 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, I appreciate the

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 opportunity to respond. I apologize about the video. With  
2 the weather out there, we've had it bad with issues all  
3 weekend in my subdivision. I will say that we've got a  
4 concern because what your original proposed order and what the  
5 Plaintiffs are seeking is going to basically take certain  
6 voting equipment out of the equation for the election  
7 scheduled to take place this Tuesday, as well as the election  
8 scheduled to take place on January 5th, because Plaintiffs are  
9 wanting us to hold and basically mothball and preserve these  
10 machines at the county level - not in our possession, not in  
11 our custody and control - at the county level. They want to  
12 preserve those in the form that they were in after the  
13 November 3rd election. Under state law there is an obligation  
14 on those county election officials to preserve the data. But  
15 the State of Georgia has set up a system where the actual  
16 equipment is used at each successive election in the cycle.  
17 And there is a certain amount of recalibration in terms of  
18 getting them ready. For the individual machines, they are not  
19 going to have the November 3rd, 2020 ballot card being  
20 inserted in them. They are not going to have that database  
21 built in any longer. You're going to have a December 1st,  
22 2020 database in the machines and in the tabulation computers.  
23 You're going to have a January 5th, 2020 database tabulating  
24 the results of the federal and state-wide run-off on January  
25 5th. They have cited to *Curling*. *Curling* is inapposite

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 because it was decided before the 11th Circuit's  
2 redressability decision in *Jacobson*. In addition, they are  
3 wanting you to poke the procedure. You've got election  
4 officials who, as of Tuesday morning, have to turn on the  
5 lights, conduct in-person voting, Tuesday night of this week  
6 have to tabulate results on the very equipment that the  
7 Plaintiffs are wanting you to take out of circulation. And  
8 that gets -- now it is so broad, based on what Ms. Powell has  
9 asked in some of her more recent emails, you've now implicated  
10 the *Purcell* line of cases and the progeny as interpreted by  
11 this circuit that says Plaintiffs don't get to come in and  
12 poke at an election procedure that is currently underway.

13 THE COURT: Let me interrupt you, Mr. Willard.  
14 First of all, refresh my recollection. The election in two  
15 days, which is December 1, is that the run-off for the Public  
16 Service Commissioner? Or is that on January 5, 2021?

17 MR. WILLARD: The Public Service Commission race has  
18 been moved to January 5th, 2021.

19 THE COURT: What is December 1?

20 MR. WILLARD: Basically any local race that is still  
21 out there that --

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. WILLARD: For example, the Athens Clarke County,  
24 Oconee County and, I forget, I think it's the Northeastern  
25 Judicial Circuit, that District Attorney's race is on the

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 ballot for this Tuesday.

2 THE COURT: I remember that.

3 MR. WILLARD: Clarke County and Oconee are going to  
4 be voting in that.

5 THE COURT: Right.

6 MR. WILLARD: I am not aware here on Sunday evening  
7 at 7:59 what other counties may have races on Tuesday and what  
8 may not. We've been sort of struggling ever since the  
9 Plaintiffs filed their emergency motion right before midnight  
10 on Friday that we saw sometime around lunchtime on Saturday.  
11 We've sort of been scrambling. I don't think all of my  
12 clients have still seen everything, as Plaintiffs acknowledge.  
13 There has been a complete absence of notice requisite to grant  
14 any relief as to the temporary hearing at this point, because  
15 I haven't been able to communicate with all of my clients to  
16 see if all of my clients have even been properly served with  
17 the emergency motion.

18 Plaintiffs have been sort of trying to do this by  
19 the seat of their pants, and they keep asking for this sort of  
20 ever-shifting claim of relief that they are saying isn't going  
21 to matter all that much in the grand scheme of things, but in  
22 terms of a currently underway election, it is going to be  
23 throwing sugar in that gas tank and gumming up the works for  
24 not only the December 1st election, but also the January 5th  
25 election, as well as the recount that is underway.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1           THE COURT: Well, I am having the impression, from  
2 what you've just said, Mr. Willard, that there really is not  
3 expected to be much turnout for Tuesday's elections, whatever  
4 remains statewide. Obviously we are going to have an enormous  
5 turnout January 5th, 2021. I just -- you know, I don't fault  
6 the Defendants for complaining about the timing, and the fact  
7 that they've been given precious little time to respond to the  
8 Plaintiffs' requests. I don't blame them. And my draft  
9 proposed orders, the two that we are discussing from today,  
10 both reflect a hearing schedule that reflects my understanding  
11 of the State's position. In other words, I feel like, you  
12 know, you've complained, understandably, about the timing and  
13 said you need a little more time, and I feel like I am giving  
14 you that by having the hearing on Friday, giving you till  
15 Wednesday to file the brief in opposition. Believe me, I am  
16 not saying that you are getting an abundance of time, but to  
17 me, I divided that baby as fair as I thought I could, and I  
18 feel like I am giving you enough time. My point is, if I am  
19 going to give you that time, I don't understand why it is  
20 asking too much. And forget for just a moment the argument  
21 about it's not under the Secretary of State's control. I  
22 understand that argument. I am going to deal with that in a  
23 minute. Laying that aside for a second, the question is, why  
24 isn't there enough already -- let me put it like this. What  
25 you are asking for, why should you not correspondingly agree

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 to allow a quick inspection of these machines? And I guess --  
2 you know, I don't know how many counties the Plaintiffs are  
3 talking about. I think that *Jacobson* may be on point. I am  
4 not sure yet. I don't know. It seems to me hard to believe  
5 that the Plaintiffs should have to sue 159 elections  
6 commissioners to get the relief they want. I understand  
7 exactly what *Jacobson* said, but that was a different case.  
8 What I am trying to accomplish here is, taking into both  
9 sides' consideration, their arguments, their respective  
10 positions, but incorporating into them also the law. The  
11 Plaintiffs want to seize these and impound these machines for  
12 a forensic audit by their experts.

13 Let me go back to Ms. Powell and ask you,  
14 Ms. Powell, which machines are we talking about? Are you  
15 talking about in every county in Georgia? Where exactly are  
16 you talking about?

17 MS. POWELL: No, Your Honor. In our motion we asked  
18 specifically for machines in ten counties.

19 THE COURT: Those ten counties that you've  
20 highlighted. Okay.

21 MS. POWELL: Yes, sir.

22 THE COURT: And what do you want to do with those  
23 machines? How long is it going to take your experts to do  
24 their thing on those machines?

25 MS. POWELL: It will take approximately a day of

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 time per county, but we can dispatch three separate teams and  
2 be able to do the bulk of it I would think within three days.

3 THE COURT: Okay. What do you say in response to  
4 Mr. Willard's argument -- I wasn't -- let me go back to  
5 Mr. Willard and just make sure I am clear on this.  
6 Mr. Willard, specifically with respect to the Clarke County  
7 and Oconee County DA's I guess it is a run-off. I don't  
8 remember if it's a run-off or a special election. But for the  
9 record, which is it, Mr. Willard?

10 MR. WILLARD: It is a special election run-off.

11 THE COURT: Yeah.

12 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, if I can clarify for the  
13 record, that is just one example of a race that is scheduled  
14 to be run on Tuesday. There are a myriad other races that we  
15 anticipate are being held throughout Georgia, we just haven't  
16 had the opportunity to compile an exhaustive list.

17 THE COURT: I understand.

18 MR. WILLARD: But we are letting you know that there  
19 is a race scheduled for Tuesday.

20 THE COURT: Right. I understand. I guess what I am  
21 wondering is -- well, I guess -- let me think this through.  
22 It seems to me that the question should be, and we might -- I  
23 might give y'all a little bit of time to find this out. Other  
24 than the -- are there any elections set in these ten counties  
25 that are going to take place this Tuesday, December 1? And if

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 so, are the Plaintiffs going to, to get the relief they want,  
2 are they going to have to access these machines and not have a  
3 -- which would prevent these ten counties from having the  
4 machines to use for those Tuesday elections?

5 MR. WILLARD: I'm sorry, Your Honor, is that  
6 addressed to me or Ms. Powell?

7 THE COURT: I am kind of thinking out loud and  
8 addressing both of you. Basically we have narrowed it from  
9 159 down to 10 counties. And the Defendants right now can't  
10 tell me, and I don't fault them for that at all, what  
11 elections are taking place, if any, in those ten counties this  
12 coming Tuesday in two days. So how am I supposed to -- and so  
13 that is one issue, is this may be moot if it turns out that  
14 there is not even an election taking place in those ten  
15 counties on Tuesday, I don't see what the problem would be of  
16 me entering a temporary restraining order allowing the  
17 Plaintiffs to have quick access to those machines for a  
18 forensic examination. On the other hand, if there is going to  
19 be an election in any of those ten counties, that raises the  
20 question of can they still have the election without those  
21 machines. Do you have to look at every single machine? I  
22 mean, I don't understand how it works.

23 So I guess I would ask Ms. Powell, let's suppose  
24 that in two or three of the ten counties that you are  
25 interested in, there are in fact going to be run-off elections

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 on Tuesday, December 1. How can your objective be met, your  
2 objective being a forensic examination of those machines in  
3 those counties if there is going to be an election there on  
4 Tuesday?

5 MS. POWELL: We can get experts to them tomorrow,  
6 Your Honor. We've got at least three teams of experts that  
7 could be dispatched to three separate counties to collect the  
8 information from the machines. The important part is, it's  
9 not just the data that comes out of the machines that is  
10 crucial to the fraud case that is so rampant across the  
11 country, it is the fact that an algorithm we believe was  
12 uploaded to the Dominion machines that weighted the votes for  
13 Mr. Biden over the votes for President Trump at approximately  
14 1.22 versus .78, and that is what would change with any  
15 alteration of the software that is crucial to making the proof  
16 of the fraud absolutely conclusive and irrefutable. We know  
17 they have already gone into the machines in Fulton County to  
18 change the software with no basis to do so whatsoever. In  
19 fact, there is an attorney that contacted me just earlier  
20 today, in fact while I was replying to the last message from  
21 the Court. I believe her last name is Broyles, a Ms. Broyles,  
22 who had been contacted by a witness who was very concerned by  
23 what she had seen down at the Center today, and felt like it  
24 was an abject pretense that they were going to be redoing all  
25 the same ballots and there was no reason to change the

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 software for any reason whatsoever.

2 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Willard, what is your  
3 response to that?

4 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, I apologize. I am used to  
5 dealing with facts and law, not innuendo and accusation. The  
6 bottom line here, the Plaintiffs have sent you a copy of the  
7 *Curling* order which, as I mentioned earlier, is inapposite  
8 because it predates *Jacobson*. But in that case, where the  
9 security and reliability of the DRE machines, which have now  
10 been retired, even Judge Totenberg recognized that you cannot  
11 willy-nilly allow individuals from outside of state and county  
12 custody and control procedures to have access to these  
13 machines. It poses a security risk for Ms. Powell's minions  
14 to go in and image everything, download the software, and  
15 figure out for future elections a way to hack in so that their  
16 preferred candidates can win. That is in effect what they are  
17 seeking here. They want to image, as they just said, not only  
18 the data on the machines, but also the entire software package  
19 and the security protocols that are set up. That is something  
20 that no Federal Court can possibly countenance. Even if they  
21 had the appropriate defendants here, which they don't, you  
22 cannot allow, during the midst of an election cycle, a third  
23 party to come in and get the proverbial keys to the software  
24 kingdom. I will say that we are trying to get up to speed on  
25 this as much as possible. Our office is not representing the

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 Secretary in the *Curling* litigation because our office was  
2 forced to declare a conflict several years ago, but we have  
3 Conflict Special Attorneys General who have spent months and  
4 years dealing with the security of the State's electronic  
5 voting system in Federal Court. There was a whole procedure  
6 set up where you had a white room established in Virginia  
7 where experts were only permitted to go in and inspect a  
8 single machine at that white room after security protocols  
9 were set in place where they couldn't remove anything from  
10 there, where they weren't able to take anything that could  
11 later compromise the system with them when they left.

12 MS. POWELL: Well it's a little bit late to be  
13 worrying about the compromise of the system. That happened,  
14 as we have evidence that both Iran and China were hacking into  
15 the system during our election, not to mention any number of  
16 other foreign entities and domestic actors as well. The  
17 entire system was built to be both hackable from afar and  
18 locally to overwrite votes, to overwrite review of signature,  
19 to drag and drop ballots into the trash can as wanted. It was  
20 conceived and created by Mr. Chavez's regime for the very  
21 purpose of ensuring that he won future elections. As corrupt  
22 as it could possibly be. And that's the system that the  
23 Georgia Secretary of State decided was appropriate to run in  
24 Georgia, despite any number of revelations of the myriad  
25 problems it has.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 THE COURT: The problem I have --

2 MS. POWELL: A two-year-old can hack these machines  
3 as they are now, and we are certainly amenable to having an  
4 observer and videotaping the process that we use to create the  
5 mirror images, and to submitting it and holding it under a  
6 protective order.

7 THE COURT: And am I correct in expecting that the  
8 Defendants further contend that these are -- there is  
9 proprietary information on these machines that should not be  
10 publicly disclosed?

11 MR. WILLARD: Yes, Your Honor, as well as from a  
12 security protocol standpoint.

13 THE COURT: Right. Okay. Well, here is the  
14 problem. It's Sunday, November 29th at 8:12 p.m. This motion  
15 did not come in until late Friday night. I was not aware of  
16 the motion until Saturday. And the State, including the  
17 Secretary of State, the Governor, and the Elections Board  
18 members have hardly had any opportunity to respond to these  
19 allegations. I don't know if that is anybody's fault. I  
20 don't know at this particular point -- I haven't considered  
21 the issue of whether the suit should have been brought earlier  
22 and the Plaintiffs are guilty of laches. I have no opinion on  
23 that issue at this point. But what I do have an opinion on is  
24 that the burden is on the Plaintiffs, and the relief that they  
25 seek is extraordinary. And although they make allegations of

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1       tremendous worldwide improprieties regarding the Dominion  
2       voting machines, those allegations are supported by precious  
3       little proof. Now let's just suppose hypothetically that the  
4       obligations are true, and there simply has not been time to  
5       marshal the evidence in support of those allegations. The  
6       problem with that is that that doesn't create an exception for  
7       me as to whether I should grant this extraordinary relief of a  
8       temporary restraining order, which of course can only be  
9       granted in truly extraordinary circumstances, and the  
10      Defendant -- and it's not even clear to the Court that the  
11      named Defendants are the proper parties to this lawsuit with  
12      respect to this particular form of relief that the Plaintiffs  
13      are seeking. So I am going to deny the Plaintiffs' request  
14      for a temporary restraining order on the grounds that the  
15      Plaintiffs have failed to carry their burden of showing a  
16      substantial likelihood, a real likelihood of prevailing on the  
17      merits on this claim, or at least I am going to refrain from  
18      granting that relief now. If, in the course of discovery in  
19      this case, the Plaintiffs become -- the Plaintiffs acquire  
20      additional proof that would support their allegations that  
21      might make a difference, I am happy to revisit this order.  
22      But for now, that is going to be the order of the Court. I am  
23      going to deny the request for temporary injunctive relief.

24               And here is what we are going to do regarding the  
25      scheduling. The Plaintiffs' response to Defendants' motion

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 will be due on Wednesday December 2 by -- I am going to change  
2 that to 5 o'clock p.m. Eastern Standard Time. If the  
3 Plaintiffs choose to file a reply, it will be due 24 hours  
4 after the Defendants' response is filed. And we will have an  
5 in-person hearing in my Atlanta courtroom this coming Friday  
6 at 10 o'clock a.m. to consider the balance of the claims that  
7 have been raised by the Plaintiffs in their complaint. All  
8 right. Anything else, Counsel?

9 MR. WOOD: Judge Batten, this is Lin Wood. How are  
10 you, sir?

11 THE COURT: Yes, sir. How are you doing, sir?

12 MR. WOOD: I am doing well. Please let me make one  
13 request.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. WOOD: I understand Your Honor's ruling. I kind  
16 of live under the theory that he who has nothing to hide hides  
17 nothing. Would there be any way -- would there be any way to  
18 give us a very limited, such for example let us go in  
19 tomorrow, pick two or three counties, and then randomly two or  
20 three machines and do the forensics on that? Because at least  
21 we would have some information in the event all of these  
22 machines end up being wiped clean? Something very --

23 THE COURT: At first blush, I don't have -- I would  
24 not have too much of a problem with that. It certainly is  
25 more reasonable than what we have talked about. But the

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1     problem is, again, the State has represented to me that -- the  
2     Defendants have represented to me, through counsel, that there  
3     are security concerns that they have, and I am being asked to  
4     decide this on a Sunday night, have been received no evidence  
5     from the Defendants because they haven't had a chance. So I  
6     am going to respectfully deny, Lin, your request. But you  
7     know, I am going to leave it with -- it is hard for me to  
8     believe -- let me ask this. Let me put it this way. Doesn't  
9     sound like 159 counties in Georgia are going to have special  
10    run-off elections on Tuesday, special election run-offs, I  
11    should say, on Tuesday. Why can't you -- if we can find ways  
12    to protect the State's legitimate interest in security and  
13    proprietary software, can you not look for the algorithm that  
14    you claim is there and any other incriminating evidence from  
15    some of the other counties, from one or more of the counties  
16    where no election is going to take place Tuesday? Why can't  
17    you do that?

18           MR. WOOD: Your Honor, this is Mr. Wood again. We  
19    can do that. And in fact, this one solution would be if we  
20    identify a very limited number of machines, number of  
21    counties, we can have our experts come in and do a mirror  
22    image, we can turn it over to the Court so there are no  
23    security concerns, and then it can be examined at a different  
24    time. But the problem is, once the machines are wiped, the  
25    evidence is gone. If there is nothing there, there is nothing

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1       there. But at least we will have an opportunity to check on a  
2       limited basis and we can preserve it and secure the security  
3       of it by having our experts, with their oversight, mirror  
4       image and then turn it over to the possession of the Court for  
5       a later review. But we don't get that opportunity, once lost  
6       we will never get it again. I don't see any harm to the State  
7       to preserve this information on a very limited basis.

8               THE COURT: Okay, I am having a hard time  
9       identifying any such harm myself. Mr. Willard, what would be  
10      wrong with the Plaintiffs being granted access to three of the  
11      counties not among -- not in any county where there is going  
12      to be an election this coming Tuesday, but tomorrow be granted  
13      access in three of these where all of the evidence that are  
14      obtained by Plaintiffs' experts will be accompanied by  
15      forensic experts from the Defendants. I know you may not be  
16      able to line that up by tomorrow, so it probably wouldn't be  
17      tomorrow, but where we can have a forensic expert with the  
18      Plaintiffs on behalf of the Defendants accompanying and  
19      overseeing the Plaintiffs' expert's inspection of the  
20      machines; and then with all of the data and all of the  
21      information obtained from that inspection, or those three  
22      inspections, to be turned over to the Court in camera and not  
23      provided to Plaintiffs or their counsel or anybody else until  
24      further order of the Court? That's -- I want to hear your  
25      response, Mr. Willard. But I have to say, at first blush that

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 doesn't sound very unreasonable to me. What is the response?  
2 And again, we are laying aside for a moment whether or not  
3 they have sued the right parties. We are not going to address  
4 that yet. But let's assume that they did, and let's assume  
5 that they do have standing, what is wrong with that proposal  
6 that I have just suggested?

7 MR. WILLARD: Well Your Honor, I think you've hit  
8 the nail on the head, and it is sort of impossible to set  
9 aside *Jacobson*. There is no redressability here as to any of  
10 these machines right now. They are not in the custody and  
11 control of the State Defendants. You can order us every day  
12 this week; we cannot give you access to the Hart County voting  
13 machines. I cannot go in and tell the Hart County Elections  
14 Superintendent to do squat in regards to discovery in a case  
15 that they are not a party to. Second, if you are violating  
16 trade secrets and security protocols, it doesn't matter if you  
17 are doing it for one machine or the entirety of machines. If  
18 Plaintiffs' experts are going to come in with a thumb drive  
19 and stick it in and take their screwdrivers out and do  
20 everything to these machines, we have no safeguards that we  
21 can put in place, in this very compressed time frame that  
22 Plaintiffs are wanting to have, where you prevent somebody  
23 from sticking that thumb drive in their pocket and walking out  
24 the door, or doing something else that is going to impact that  
25 machine for future elections.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 THE COURT: Mr. Wood, I will give you the last word.

2 MR. WOOD: I don't believe we will be using  
3 screwdrivers. I think we can do a simple mirror image, they  
4 can see it done, and then it will be turned over to the Court.  
5 If we've got the wrong parties, we've got the wrong parties.  
6 But if we have the right parties, and the Court determines  
7 that the Secretary of State does have the authority as we  
8 contend that the Secretary of State does, I don't see any  
9 harm. We will turn it over to the Court. The battles can be  
10 fought. If we win, then we can have -- we can have the  
11 examination completed. But if we don't get something, then we  
12 end up with nothing, and we don't know whether or not it was  
13 erased. I don't see any downside, Your Honor. We turn it  
14 over to you and hold it until further rulings in the case. It  
15 is just a matter of preserving some reasonably minimum amount  
16 of evidence with respect to some of these machines.

17 MS. POWELL: I believe there are no elections Your  
18 Honor in Cobb, Gwinnett, Cherokee, or Forsyth, or Paulding, or  
19 Hall, or Houston, or Hart, or Hancock, all of which we have  
20 requested, or Gwinnett or Henry. In fact, Defendants haven't  
21 said where there are any elections at all.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. WILLARD: One last point, if I could.

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 MR. WILLARD: I would point you -- you know, I know

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1       there has been some question about whether the *Jacobson*  
2       decision applies to voting equipment, and decisions made  
3       regarding voting equipment. I would point you to the *Anderson*  
4       case, *Anderson versus Raffensperger*, decided by Judge Brown  
5       last month, the docket number is 1:20-CV-03263. It is a  
6       78-page decision, and it is very well-reasoned. And pages 62  
7       through 68 go into great detail about how the failure to  
8       include county election officials presented a redressability  
9       problem. Remember, Your Honor, you didn't choose who the  
10      Plaintiffs sued, I didn't choose who the Plaintiffs sued. The  
11      Plaintiffs knew or should have been aware of the *Jacobson* line  
12      of cases and its progeny. You --

13               MS. POWELL: *Jacobson* is Florida law.

14               THE COURT: Let him finish.

15               MR. WILLARD: -- cannot craft relief to county  
16      defendants --

17               THE COURT: Go ahead.

18               MR. WILLARD: You cannot craft relief that goes to  
19      county defendants and equipment in county custody and control  
20      where the Plaintiffs have only chosen to sue State Defendants.

21               THE COURT: Ms. Powell, let me ask you this along  
22      those lines of what he is saying. I understand the  
23      distinction that the Plaintiffs have argued through their  
24      counsel's emails to me today between this case and *Jacobson*.  
25      But you know, it sounds to me that Mr. Willard is probably

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 correct that as a matter of fact and law, the Secretary of  
2 State can't call up to Marietta and tell the Cobb County  
3 elections officials what to do with their machine. What you  
4 want to do is access the machine. You are not talking about  
5 data results from the election. You want to actually access  
6 the physical machines for a forensic inspection. And --

7 MS. POWELL: Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Just a second. And so this is the first  
9 time we are really addressing the redressability issue. Tell  
10 me what is the Plaintiffs' response to that.

11 MS. POWELL: The machines are owned by the State of  
12 Georgia. They were purchased by the State of Georgia for \$107  
13 million of taxpayer money. They are controlled by the  
14 Secretary of State's office which has legal responsibility  
15 both for investigating the fraud and making sure the machines  
16 are what are supposed to be used and properly used and  
17 enforcing the rules and regulations and laws related to  
18 elections for the State of Georgia. It is clear from the  
19 *Curling* decision that we do not have to sue 600 people in 159  
20 counties to obtain the relief we want. It couldn't be more  
21 clear as a matter of law.

22 MR. WOOD: Judge, could I say one last thing?

23 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

24 MR. WOOD: And I appreciate this has all been done  
25 with not a lot of time.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 THE COURT: Right.

2 MR. WOOD: Again, if we don't have the correct  
3 parties, we can add the correct parties before the Court would  
4 release for further examination the materials that we would  
5 collect in the next day or two.

6 THE COURT: I don't understand why the Plaintiffs  
7 don't just move to add Cobb County as a party to the case, or  
8 the Cobb -- I don't know who it is, Cobb County elections  
9 officers? I don't know. I am not going to give you a legal  
10 opinion.

11 MR. WOOD: Let me say this. If the Court gives us  
12 until Tuesday to examine, we will add the counties that the  
13 Court lets us go examine, we will add them tomorrow; add them  
14 tonight. I just don't think -- I think that is a procedural  
15 issue, and ultimately one the Court can decide, but there is  
16 no harm, Your Honor, in preserving what could be critical  
17 evidence with respect to this election. We are not asking to  
18 look at it until we've got it all down pat and Your Honor is  
19 satisfied we are entitled to it, but let's preserve at least  
20 some small amount reasonably so we don't find ourselves with  
21 no evidence simply because the evidence was erased or  
22 destroyed. If there is nothing there, there is nothing there.  
23 But, Your Honor, if there is something there, then this state  
24 has a serious problem. And I think it ought to be in the  
25 interest of the taxpayers and the voters that this material,

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 on a reasonable basis, limited basis, be preserved so that  
2 down the road, if we meet all the other qualifications to have  
3 it fully examined, we've at least got it preserved. That  
4 seems to me to be in the best interest of the citizens of the  
5 State of Georgia.

6 THE COURT: Well let me go back --

7 MS. POWELL: We have obtained access to machines in  
8 another state, with no problem of damage to the machines or  
9 exposure of trade secrets or any other concern, and in that  
10 instance we found that there were 1,474 votes on two rolls on  
11 a machine, 1,474 which were changed across the two rolls,  
12 almost the same number of voters that voted had their votes  
13 completely changed on Dominion machines.

14 THE COURT: Where was that?

15 MS. POWELL: That is a county in Michigan.

16 THE COURT: That was this year?

17 MS. POWELL: Yes, sir. Just a few days ago.

18 THE COURT: Right, okay. And again, just for my  
19 factual understanding, Mr. Willard, are you telling me that if  
20 I grant this relief, let's say to -- if I were to add a couple  
21 of these counties as defendants, or whatever the right entity  
22 or person is that should be the defendant, are you telling me  
23 that if I grant this relief for this forensic inspection,  
24 there is no way that any election run-off can take place on  
25 Tuesday in that county? Or do you know?

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1           MR. WILLARD: That is my understanding right now.  
2       Once again, I am working on Sunday night at 8:28 p.m. and  
3       something that I've been aware of for a little over 24 hours.  
4       But at this point in time, Your Honor has already indicated  
5       which way he was going to rule, and now Plaintiffs are trying  
6       to shift the ground underneath us. The fact is, as I  
7       indicated to your clerk last night, Ms. McGowan and I have now  
8       given up the entirety of our Sunday, we have responded in a  
9       timely fashion, at the Court's request, first on a  
10      three-and-a-half-hour turnaround, and then on an hour  
11      turnaround, substantively responding to Plaintiffs' arguments.  
12      And their responses have been long on rhetoric and short on  
13      any authority. We are at a situation now where if the Court  
14      is willing to do what it said it was going to do earlier in  
15      this call and earlier this evening via email and deny relief,  
16      we go on and we prepare for the Friday hearing. If the Court  
17      is inclined to grant the relief, we would ask you to certify  
18      it so that we can immediately take it up to the 11th Circuit  
19      and the 11th Circuit can reassure the Plaintiff that it meant  
20      what it said when it ruled in *Jacobson*.

21           THE COURT: All right, I am going to have to think  
22      about it. I am not sure yet what I am going to do, but I need  
23      to do some research and think about it a little bit. I am  
24      trying to -- I would like, Mr. Willard -- I am sure we are  
25      going to talk again tomorrow. I guess we ought to just --

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 let's plan on an 11 o'clock Zoom hearing tomorrow to address  
2 some of these issues. And I am going to want to know -- let  
3 me just say, in terms of what I am thinking out loud is that  
4 if I were to allow -- let me first ask this question of  
5 Ms. Powell and Mr. Wood. If I were to allow the forensic  
6 inspection of either the Cobb or Gwinnett or Cherokee or Hart,  
7 whatever -- wouldn't it just be sufficient to add one of those  
8 counties? If it is the same machine?

9 MS. POWELL: No, Your Honor. The counties can read  
10 differently. We really request Cobb, Gwinnett, and Cherokee  
11 counties at the bare minimum.

12 THE COURT: Okay. I hear you.

13 MS. POWELL: And we can add those as Defendants  
14 tonight if that is important to the Court. I really don't  
15 think it's necessary as a matter of law, but we can certainly  
16 add them.

17 THE COURT: Who exactly would you move to add?

18 MS. POWELL: The Board of Elections of each -- all  
19 the members of the boards of those four counties. We would  
20 have to add 12 people.

21 THE COURT: I heard three counties. Cobb, Gwinnett,  
22 and Cherokee.

23 MS. POWELL: Three counties, but four people per  
24 county, is my understanding.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Here is what I would like to do.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 Mr. Willard, if you could tell me when we resume tomorrow at  
2 11:00, if you could tell me, having done a little research,  
3 what impact, if any, allowing this forensic examination on  
4 these three counties' machines would have on the elections  
5 that are supposed to take place Tuesday? It may be that there  
6 is no election in any of those counties, there may be an  
7 election in all three of them. I have no idea.

8 MS. POWELL: It is my understanding, Your Honor,  
9 there is no election in those three counties.

10 THE COURT: Let me have that confirmed. I will give  
11 Mr. Willard a chance to confirm that tomorrow. And also --

12 MR. WILLARD: That was Cobb, Gwinnett, and Cherokee.  
13 Correct, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

15 MS. POWELL: Correct.

16 THE COURT: I want to hear a little more on the  
17 issue of how would -- you know, one of the issues in the  
18 decision of whether to grant injunctive relief is what harm  
19 the party opposing the injunction would suffer if the relief  
20 were granted. That is one of the four factors that I am sure  
21 all of you know quite well, I certainly would expect that you  
22 do. I know you do. I would like to hear, Mr. Willard, from  
23 you tomorrow morning if you could please tell me -- if you  
24 could answer that question for me. What harm would it do the  
25 State or to these Defendants, including any newly added

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 Defendants, if I were to grant that relief?

2 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, I will do my best, but it  
3 may not be me on the call. As I indicated to your clerk,  
4 we've got two brief responses in the *Woods* case due on  
5 Tuesday. We've already had to give up our Sunday responding  
6 to this, after I asked your clerk last night not to schedule  
7 anything until after those briefs were filed. Now because of  
8 Plaintiffs' shifting demands, they want to go forward with a  
9 hearing in the morning. Whoever is going to respond to that  
10 hearing is going to have to take time away from getting the  
11 responses filed in the 11th Circuit on Tuesday, including our  
12 client, in the midst of an ongoing state-wide recount for  
13 President, in the midst of conducting and supporting county  
14 election officials with the December 1st election, as well as  
15 getting ready for early and advanced voting for the January  
16 5th election. We --

17 THE COURT: I understand, Mr. Willard. Let me ask a  
18 question of Ms. Powell. If there are in fact no elections  
19 taking place in those three counties, why does this have to be  
20 done tomorrow? Why do we have to have the answer to this by  
21 tomorrow or Tuesday?

22 MS. POWELL: Time is of the essence, Your Honor, on  
23 the entire election proceeding.

24 THE COURT: I got you. In other words, the general  
25 time-is-of-the-essence principle. It sounds to me like having

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 a response by 11:00 tomorrow is not necessary and would be  
2 unreasonable to expect the Secretary of State, the Governor  
3 and the Elections Board Defendants to be able to respond so  
4 quickly. So here is what I am going to do. I am going to  
5 reserve ruling. I am going to keep the schedule regarding  
6 briefing and the hearing, and I am going to reserve ruling on  
7 the Plaintiffs' request -- I am going to consider it a motion  
8 to amend the pleadings, and a motion to add as parties these  
9 elections officers in Cobb, Gwinnett, and Cherokee counties.  
10 I want the Secretary of State to let me know -- I will give  
11 you a deadline in the second, but what I want the Secretary of  
12 State and the other Defendants to let me know is what  
13 opposition, if any, they have or what conditions they would  
14 like to see complied with if these machines are going to be  
15 inspected. In other words, if they want their own inspector  
16 there, et cetera. I agree with Ms. Powell on the general  
17 principle that time is of the essence, but it is not at all  
18 reasonable to give the Defendants in this case until 11  
19 o'clock tomorrow morning. There is just no way they can do  
20 that. I am trying to decide right now how much time to give  
21 them. It certainly is going to be this week. I guess,  
22 Mr. Willard, what I would like you to do is let me know, as  
23 soon as you find out, but in any event you are going to have  
24 to let me know by Wednesday. That is what my first blush  
25 issue is this issue. I just don't see what the urgency is.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 The case will still be pending after this week. So I just --  
2 you know, I understand the -- I completely understand the  
3 general urgency of the case, but the Defendants have got to  
4 have a little bit of time to provide that information I want,  
5 which again namely is whether they would oppose these three  
6 counties' machines being forensically examined, and why they  
7 would -- what the basis for any such opposition would be, and  
8 I would want that supported with an affidavit or affidavits  
9 from an expert or experts or somebody affiliated with the  
10 Defendants who could provide evidence to why that would be  
11 harmful. Again, we are focusing on the -- I believe is the  
12 third prong -- I may have them in the wrong order -- of the  
13 four-part test, which is what the harm would be to the party  
14 opposing the injunctive relief. So that is going to be the  
15 order of the Court. And I will --

16 MR. KLEINHENDLER: Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Yes, sir?

18 MR. KLEINHENDLER: I wanted to make one point here.  
19 And that is, I understand the State's concern about having us  
20 go in and look at their machines. However, what we have  
21 alleged with affidavit testimony is that they are erasing  
22 their machines. So while they are thinking about what the  
23 harm is, and while they are figuring out where their elections  
24 are that they can't identify, at a minimum, Your Honor, where  
25 there are no elections to be taking place, there should be an

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 order entered now that no machine should be erased. Because  
2 that is very troubling, it is spoliation, it's irreparable  
3 injury. That is point one. I want to make one other point  
4 for you, Your Honor. They mentioned that the county is under  
5 an obligation to preserve the evidence of the election. Let  
6 me explain to you what they preserve. They have these  
7 machines that people vote on, and they produce these memory  
8 cards. They make a copy of the memory card, but the machine  
9 stays the same. It's sort of like you have an iPhone --

10 THE COURT: I understand.

11 MR. KLEINHENDLER: You can take out the sim, right?

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MR. KLEINHENDLER: So I would ask Your Honor to  
14 please order no more erasing machines that are not being --

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. KLEINHENDLER: -- used for these local  
17 elections --

18 THE COURT: That sounds reasonable to me,  
19 Mr. Willard, until we resolve this in just a few days. Do  
20 your clients have any objection to that? The way I would  
21 phrase it, and I am going to give you a chance to respond to  
22 this, but my inclination is to order and temporarily restrain  
23 the Defendants to the extent it is within their lawful  
24 authority, from altering or destroying or erasing or allowing  
25 the alteration, destruction, or erasing of any of the computer

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 information on any of the machines in these three counties  
2 that we discussed, specifically Cobb, Gwinnett, and Cherokee.  
3 What is y'all's response? What is the State's response to  
4 that, Mr. Willard?

5 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, I will say that there are  
6 no State officials, there is no one within the direction and  
7 control of any of the named State Defendants who is going to  
8 be doing anything in regards to this voting equipment this  
9 week or in the coming months. So you still have the same  
10 redressability issue. You can order us to stop all you want,  
11 but if we are not the ones behind the wheel, it is not doing  
12 anything.

13 THE COURT: Well then I would think that the  
14 Defendants wouldn't have any problem being ordered to stop.  
15 If they are not doing anything, there is nothing for them to  
16 stop. So that is going to be another feature of this order.  
17 And we are not going to enter a written order, it will be in  
18 the transcript. But again, to the extent that it's within the  
19 Defendants' lawful authority, they shall not alter, destroy,  
20 or erase any of this information from any of these three  
21 computers, nor will they allow anyone within their control and  
22 authority, legal authority, from doing any of those things.  
23 It sounds to me like you've been put on notice, Plaintiffs'  
24 counsel, by Mr. Willard, quite clearly that you need to direct  
25 these concerns towards these county officials. The State, in

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 this -- obviously the Defendants in this case are disavowing  
2 any authority or any responsibility or connection with these  
3 county machines in this sense, they are not going to be going  
4 down to any -- they are not going down to Lawrenceville or  
5 Canton, or Marietta to try to erase any of these machines, the  
6 concern that -- is Mr. Kleinhendler?

7 MR. KLEINHENDLER: Kleinhendler, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: I was close. Closer than you usually  
9 get, I'll bet. So let's do that. Why don't we do this, why  
10 don't we have a Zoom call tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock  
11 where we will wait to hear back from someone on behalf of the  
12 Defendants, if it is either Mr. Willard or someone else, to  
13 respond, and let us know if there is something that the Court  
14 is missing regarding the inspection, the forensic examination  
15 of these machines. So my --

16 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor?

17 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

18 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, we have moved again from  
19 Wednesday. To say --

20 THE COURT: All I want tomorrow, Rus, is an update.  
21 If they can give us an update. If you want to update. In  
22 fact, I will leave it like that. But if you want to update  
23 us, just let us know tomorrow, and we'll be ready for a call  
24 at 4 o'clock. But if you don't have anything to report  
25 tomorrow, that is perfectly fine. I understand the competing

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 interests that the Defendants have. They are trying to juggle  
2 a lot of balls in the air at one time. I understand that.  
3 Let me know if you know something tomorrow. And if not -- I  
4 guess, you know, I am -- I have to admit, you know, when I  
5 think out loud like this, which is not something judges enjoy  
6 doing because it gets pointed out to them that they are  
7 changing their mind. And I am inclined to agree with  
8 Mr. Willard on this. Let's wait until Wednesday to hear back  
9 from Mr. Willard. How about something in writing,  
10 Mr. Willard, by the same time that the brief is due on  
11 Wednesday, 5:00 p.m., in response to this inquiry that the  
12 Court has as to the basis for any opposition by the Defendants  
13 to this particular relief regarding the forensic examination  
14 of the Dominion equipment in these three counties. That is  
15 what the order of the Court is going to be. And contrary to  
16 what I said a minute ago, I will put it in writing so everyone  
17 can see it and it will be clear and you don't have to read the  
18 transcript. That order will be entered either tonight or  
19 more -- I would say almost certainly not until tomorrow  
20 morning. Okay? Anything else, Counsel? Yes, sir?

21 MR. WILLARD: Just two procedural points. One, do  
22 you want as a unified filing on Wednesday, or do you want us  
23 to make them as two separate filings?

24 THE COURT: Separate filings.

25 MR. WILLARD: All right. So I won't need, I think

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 at this juncture, to ask for a page limit extension, but I may  
2 revisit that issue with the Court.

3 THE COURT: You can have however many pages you  
4 need. There is no limit on the pages.

5 MR. MACDOUGALD: The Plaintiffs as well, Your Honor?

6 THE COURT: The Plaintiffs' response as well.

7 MR. MACDOUGALD: Thank you.

8 MR. WILLARD: Your Honor, the second point, and now  
9 that you have said that you are going to reduce this to  
10 writing, I know that there has been a lot of rumor, innuendo,  
11 and misinformation spread out there regarding what has taken  
12 place in a number of courts around the country, and this Court  
13 today, there were a number of social media posts made about  
14 this Court's indication of the two earlier rulings.

15 THE COURT: Right.

16 MR. WILLARD: I ask you to make clear in your order  
17 that only the State Defendants are being enjoined by anything  
18 in your order and it is not enjoining any county officials  
19 from doing anything.

20 THE COURT: Not at this time. They are not parties  
21 to the case yet.

22 MR. WILLARD: Thank you.

23 MR. WOOD: Judge, for what it's worth, when we add  
24 them tonight, we will be sending spoliation litigation hold  
25 letters. I think they have already received those a week ago,

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR



1 but we will redo it.

2 THE COURT: And Mr. Willard, just to be clear, you  
3 are referring to -- you refer to the Governor and the  
4 Secretary of State, not the other members of the Elections  
5 Board? Is that right?

6 MR. WILLARD: I am actually referring -- I'm sorry?

7 THE COURT: The Governor and the Secretary of State.  
8 Let's see, of course I don't -- the Governor is a party and of  
9 course the Secretary of State is a party, and then we have  
10 the --

11 MR. WILLARD: The Election Board --

12 THE COURT: -- four other Election Board members.  
13 And what you just wanted to make clear to me, or clarify with  
14 me, was that it was your understanding that the order I am  
15 going to enter would only be enjoining the Governor and the  
16 Secretary of State and not the four Election Board members who  
17 are also named as Defendants. Am I right about that?

18 MR. WILLARD: No, Your Honor. I am requesting that  
19 you make clear in your order that only the State Defendants  
20 are enjoined, and there is no injunction against any of the  
21 unnamed county defendants.

22 MR. KLEINHENDLER: Your Honor, this is Howard again.  
23 I think your language earlier was right on. You said you are  
24 going to enjoin the State Defendants and anybody in their  
25 control. And our argument is that all these counties are

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 under the control of the Secretary of State. So now if the  
2 State wants to play a game and say, well, we have no ability  
3 to control the counties, okay, we will deal with that on a  
4 sanctions motion. But I think you were very clear, Your  
5 Honor, anybody -- the Defendants and anybody under their  
6 control. What the State is asking for now is to wiggle out of  
7 that order, and I would urge you not to give to them that  
8 language. It is enough for you to say the Defendants in the  
9 case and anybody under their control.

10 THE COURT: Okay. I understand the issue. The only  
11 point I was trying to make with Mr. Willard was I was trying  
12 to see if he was trying to exclude the Governor. I understand  
13 that his main point was really that I was not ordering  
14 directly any county officials to do or not do anything. I  
15 understand that that is what he was saying. I think I  
16 understand it. I am actually clear on it. So I think  
17 everybody has their marching orders, we know what to do. I am  
18 the one that has to move next. I have to enter an order that  
19 clarifies all of this, and I think I do that with no problem.  
20 It will probably be in the morning, okay?

21 MR. MACDOUGALD: Judge, one housekeeping matter. In  
22 terms of serving future papers and filings on the Defendants,  
23 can we agree or can the Court order that service on  
24 Mr. Willard and Ms. McGowan is sufficient service on the State  
25 Defendants?

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

1 THE COURT: I can't order them to waive their right  
2 to be served.

3 MR. MACDOUGALD: Okay, but what we would have to do  
4 otherwise is send the papers directly to the State Defendants.

5 THE COURT: Right. That is a matter for you and  
6 Mr. Willard to discuss when I am not on the line. If the  
7 Defendants want to acknowledge and waive service that is fine,  
8 and if they don't that is not something that I am going to  
9 upset with a ruling.

10 MR. MACDOUGALD: Okay.

11 THE COURT: We are adjourned, and you will hear from  
12 me in the morning. Y'all have a good night.

13 (End of hearing at 8:48 p.m.)

14 \* \* \* \* \*

15 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

16  
17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
18 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lori Burgess  
Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court  
Northern District of Georgia

Date: November 30, 2020

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
LORI BURGESS, RMR

